

Jacobsthal's function and a short proof of the density of a set in the unit hypercube

Timothy Foo

*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Rutgers University - Newark,
Newark, NJ 07102, USA*

tfoo@andromeda.rutgers.edu

Abstract

We use an upper bound on Jacobsthal's function to complete a proof of a known density result. Apart from the bound on Jacobsthal's function used here, the proof we are completing uses only elementary methods and Dirichlet's Theorem on the infinitude of primes in arithmetic progressions.

Introduction

Let $A_k = \bigcup_p \{(\frac{x_1}{p}, \frac{x_2}{p}, \dots, \frac{x_k}{p}) : 1 \leq x_i < p, \prod_i x_i \equiv 1 \pmod p\}$. Let $B_k = \{(\frac{a_0}{a_1}, \frac{a_1}{a_2}, \dots, \frac{a_{k-1}}{a_k}) : (a_i, a_j) = 1, i, j > 0 \text{ and } (a_0, a_1) = 1 \text{ and } a_i < a_{i+1}\}$. Although the density of A_k in the k -dimensional unit hypercube follows from stronger results [1], an attempt was made in Theorem 3 of [2] to discuss A_k using only elementary methods and Dirichlet's Theorem on the infinitude of primes in arithmetic progressions. It was shown there that for any point in B_k , there are points in A_k that are arbitrarily close to the given point. It was not shown there that B_k is dense in the k -dimensional unit hypercube. The aim of this paper is to show that B_k is dense in the hypercube and hence to show that A_k is dense without using [1]. (See concluding remarks.) This will be done by using a bound on Jacobsthal's function $g(n)$ which arises from the work of Iwaniec [3]. Actually, all we need is Theorem 4 of [4] which uses [3].

Theorem 1 A_k is dense in the k -dimensional unit hypercube.

Preliminaries

For n a positive integer, we define $g(n)$, Jacobsthal's function, in exactly the way it is defined in [4]: we let $g(n)$ be the least integer r such that every set of r consecutive integers contains at least one integer relatively prime to n . This means one can find $g(n) - 1$ consecutive integers, all of which are not relatively prime to n . We let $\omega(n)$ be the number of distinct prime factors

dividing n . We let the Chebyshev function $\theta(n)$ be $\theta(n) = \sum_{p < n} \log p$. We let $L_{n,m} = \{l \in \mathbf{Z} : l > n, (l, m) = 1\}$, $G_{n,m} = \{\frac{n}{l} : l \in L_{n,m}\}$, and $z(n, m)$ the maximum gap between rational numbers in $G_{n,m}$. We also mention theorem 4 of [4]: There exists a constant c_1 such that $g(n) \leq c_1(\log n)^2$, $n \geq 1$

$\omega(n)$ and $g(n)$

At this point we will be quite imprecise. We want to estimate very roughly the relation between $\omega(n)$ and n . We will do this using the fact that $\theta(n)$ grows like n . Since $\theta(n) = \sum_{p < n} \log p = \log \prod_{p < n} p$ is about n , this shows that $\prod_{k=1}^r p_k$ is about $e^{y(r)}$ where $y(n) = \pi^{-1}(n)$. Now $\pi(n \log n)$ is about $\frac{n \log n}{\log(n \log n)} = \frac{n \log n}{\log n + \log \log n} < n$ so $y(n)$ grows at least like $n \log n$. So the product of the first r primes grows at least as fast as $e^{r \log r}$. Now let n be such that $\omega(n) = r$. Clearly, $n \geq \prod_{k=1}^{\omega(n)} p_k$ which grows at least as fast as $e^{\omega(n) \log(\omega(n))}$. We therefore have $\omega(n) \log(\omega(n))$ growing at most like $\log n$. This is exactly what we need to see the relation between [3] and theorem 4 of [4]. In [3] Iwaniec proves that if $C(r)$ is the maximum length of a sequence of consecutive integers each divisible by at least one of r arbitrarily chosen distinct primes then $C(r) \ll (r \log r)^2$. This is saying that if $\omega(n) = r$ then $g(n) \ll (\omega(n) \log(\omega(n)))^2$. But we just showed that $\omega(n) \log(\omega(n))$ grows at most like $\log n$. Imprecisely, we have deduced theorem 4 of [4] from [3].

Proof of Theorem 1

Consider the i -th coordinate in B_k . The numerator is a_{i-1} , while the denominator, a_i , must be relatively prime to each a_h for $1 \leq h \leq i-1$. But since the a_h themselves are pairwise relatively prime, this is just asking for $(a_i, \prod_{h=1}^{i-1} a_h) = 1$. We need to consider $z(a_{i-1}, \prod_{h=1}^{i-1} a_h)$

We now give a bound on $z(n, m)$. $z(n, m) < \frac{n}{n+1} - \frac{n}{n+1+g(m)} = \frac{n(g(m))}{(n+1)(n+1+g(m))}$.

Let $n = a_{i-1}$, $m = \prod_{h=1}^{i-1} a_h$. We have $m < (a_{i-1})^{i-1} < a_{i-1}^k = n^k$. We now use Theorem 4 of [4].

So $g(m) \leq c_1(\log m)^2 < c_1(k \log n)^2$. This shows that B_k is dense, and hence that A_k is dense. Theorem 1 is proved.

Concluding Remarks

It is not completely clear to me at this point whether [1] or [3] uses more powerful methods or whether there is any overlap. The reader should take this into consideration.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Chun-Lin Hsueh for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] A. Granville, I. E. Shparlinski, A. Zaharescu, On the distribution of rational functions along a curve over F_p and residue races, J. Number Theory 112 (2005), no. 2, 216-237
- [2] T. Foo, A Short Proof of a Known Density Result, Integers 7 (2007), A07
- [3] H. Iwaniec, On the problem of Jacobsthal, Demonstratio Math. 11 (1978), no. 1, 225-231
- [4] J. Shallit, State Complexity and Jacobsthal's Function, Implementation and application of automata (London, ON, 2000), 272-278, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2088, Springer, Berlin, 2001